

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/540,952	Applicant(s) TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Tiffany A. Fetzner	Art Unit 2831	

All Participants:

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(2) Attorney Paul Tang reg. no. 40,837.

Date of Interview: 20 September 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1-17

Prior art documents discussed:

Pauly et al. US patent 5,150,053 A1 issued September 22, 1992.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/T. A. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2831

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted applicants representative to request permission to do an Examiner's amendment as a follow-up to the earlier telephonic in view of 9/12/2008 and In view of applicant's arguments of the June 20, 2008 amendment in response in order to clarify that it is the applicant's simultaneously applied excitation pulse within a single excitation, which is applied to multiple coils and that the excitation pulse output is maintained to be held continuously at a phase difference of 180 degrees past the temporal center of the waveform by one or more additional coils enabling the excitation pulse to excite a specific local region in a subject for imaging. The prior art teaches inverting the waveform after the temporal center but that is not equivalent to applicant's novelty of maintaining the second half of the simultaneously applied waveform at a phase difference of 180 degrees, past the waveform's temporal center so that the first half of the excitation waveform and the second half of the excitation waveform have a continuously maintained 180 degree phase difference as set forth by applicant. All of the examiner amendments, made by the examiner were approved by applicant in the September 19th 2008 telephonic interview, and are fully supported by applicant's originally filed figures.